## 

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America, )	Case No. CR 16-5312410
Plaintiff, ) v. )	STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
Christopher Kinney  Defendant.	NORTHERN DISTRICTURED ON
,	OF OF COURT CALIFORNIA
For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on Speedy Trial Act from C 2 , 2016 to served by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and	public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18
Failure to grant a continuance would be like See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	ely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
defendants, the nature of the prosecu or law, that it is unreasonable to expect ade	to [check applicable reasons] the number of ation, or the existence of novel questions of fact quate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial his section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
Failure to grant a continuance would deny t taking into account the exercise of due dilig	the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, gence. <i>See</i> 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
	sonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given ts, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
Failure to grant a continuance would unreas necessary for effective preparation, taking i See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	sonably deny the defendant the reasonable time nto account the exercise of due diligence.
IT IS SO ORDERED.  DATED: Dec. 21, Who	JACQUELINE SCOTT CORLEY United States Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED: Attorney for Defendant	Assistant United States Attorney